Ī			.	
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
2	EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS TYLER DIVISION			
3				
4	FENNER INVESTMENTS, LTD	:	DOCKET NO. 6:08CV61	
5	VS.	: :	TYLER, TEXAS	
6	VS. 3COM CORPORATION, ET AL	: :	11:00 A.M.	
7				
8	TELEPHONE CONFERENCE			
9	BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOHN D. LOVE, UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE			
10				
11	APPEARANCES BY TELEPHONE:			
12				
13	FOR THE PLAINTIFF:	IRELAN	BORAH RACE D CARROLL & KELLEY	
14			. BROADWAY, SUITE 500 TEXAS 75703	
15		мр ти	OMAS JOHN WARD, JR.	
16		WARD &	SMITH LAW FIRM OX 1231	
17			EW, TEXAS 75606	
18				
19	FOR EXTREME NETWORKS:		. MEVLIN R. WILCOX, III	
20		100 E.	UGH-WILCOX, PLLC FERGUSON, SUITE 1015 TEXAS 75702	
21		111111,	ILAAS 13102	
22			ROBERT YOCHES	
23		901 NE	AN HENDERSON FARABOW W YORK AVE NW	
24		WASHIN	GTON, DC 20001	
25				

		2
1	FOR NETGEAR:	ATTORNEY AT LAW
2		100 E. FERGUSON, SUITE 1015 TYLER, TEXAS 75702
3		
4		MR. STEVEN H. MORRISSETT FINNEGAN HENDERSON FARABOW
5		3300 HILLVIEW AVENUE PALO ALTO, CA 94304
6		
7	FOR SMC NETWORKS:	MR. WILLIAM CORNELIUS, JR. WIILSON ROBERTSON & CORNELIUS
9		909 ESE LOOP 323, SUITE 400 TYLER, TEXAS 75703
10		MR. RICHARD C. VASQUEZ
11		MR. JEFFREY T. LINDGREN VAZUEZ BENISEK & LINDGREN, LLP 3685 MT. DIABLO BLVD
12		SUITE 300 LAFAYETTE, CA 94549
13		Emmilia, on 31313
14	FOR TELLABS:	MR. JOSE CARLOS VILLARREAL WILSON SONSINI
15		8911 CAPITAL OF TEXAS HIGHWAY WESTECH 360, SUITE 3350
16		AUSTIN, TX 78759
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25	PROCEEDINGS RECORDEI	D BY ELECTRONIC SOUND RECORDING.

Case 6:08-cv-00061-LED-JDL Document 223 Filed 02/13/2009 Page 3 of 13 THE COURT: Good morning. This is Judge Love. Let me call this case. This is Case No. 6:08CV273. This is 6:08CV61. Excuse me. Let me go ahead and get announcements from the parties that are on the line. MS. RACE: Yes. Your Honor, this is Deborah Race and Johnny Ward, and we're on the line for Plaintiff Fenner. MR. WILCOX: Judge, Melvin Wilcox. I think Bobby Yoches is on the line for Extreme Networks. MR. CORNELIUS: Your Honor, Bill Cornelius along with Jeff Lindgren and Rich Vasquez on for SMC and Enterasys. MR. YARBROUGH: Your Honor, Trey Yarbrough and Steve Morrissett are on the line for Defendants D-Link Systems, Inc. and Netgear, Inc. We also serve as counsel for ZyXEL Communications, Inc., but they've recently settled and have been dismissed. MR. VILLARREAL: Your Honor, this is Jose Villarreal

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. VILLARREAL: Your Honor, this is Jose Villarreal for Tellabs, Inc. and Tellabs North America.

THE COURT: All right. Anyone else? Okay. Well, I thank you for being on the line for this conference. If you do speak, remember to state your name so we can have a record of that. We are recording this.

But the reason I wanted to have this conference is we have this Markman Hearing set for Thursday. Obviously there's been an objection to the technical adviser, Mr.

2

3

6

8

9

11

12

16

17

18

21

22

23

24

25

Egen, by the Plaintiff. I just wanted to inform the parties that in light of the Plaintiff's objection, my intention is to sustain the Plaintiff's objection, appoint Mike McLemore as technical adviser, and move this Markman Hearing to April 4 23rd. Does anyone have any objection to any of that? 5 MR. VASQUEZ: Yes, Your Honor. This is Rich Vasquez 7 for SMC and Enterasys. My firm and Bill Cornelius will be in a two week trial on April 13th known as the CSIRO trial, also before Judge Davis. So that date would be extremely 10 prejudicial at this point. THE COURT: Well, I said the 23rd. MR. VASQUEZ: Well, as I say, it's a two week trial so it's not going to be over until the 30th, so any time in the 13 14 month of April would be very prejudicial. 15 THE COURT: All right. Any other objection? MR. VILLARREAL: Your Honor, Jose Villarreal for Tellabs. Not an objection per se to the date but a ramification that may come from that, given the expert report 19 deadline that we have pending. It would be very inefficient to 20 proceed with those without the Markman, at least some guidance from the Markman.

So our request would be just that the other deadlines be considered, given that the Markman date would be changed. So, in other words, that those dates be also moved so that we can proceed with the expert reports with more efficiency. THE COURT: Okay. Anything else?

MR. MORRISSETT: Your Honor, Steve Morrissett for Extreme Netgear and D-Links. Also, just to inform you, we did receive an inquiry from the Plaintiff's counsel about actually moving the expert report date. I'm not sure what the status of that is right now, but they had proposed a couple of weeks ago delaying the expert report date for -- for other reasons.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Anything else? Okay. Well, you know, this has just put us in a situation where this unfortunate late objection to Mr. Egen has just caused the movement of this Markman to become necessary apparently.

So as far as the other dates, I am sympathetic as far as those dates are concerned. If the parties want to get together and try to agree on some dates the best you can, you can do that and submit that to the Court and the Court will take a look at that and see if we can move those dates.

At this point obviously I want to try to keep the trial date, if possible. I believe you have a trial date of October 13th, so that's going to remain. But any other dates that y'all can agree to, please do and submit those to the Court and we'll take a look at them.

But as I say, it just necessitated moving this Markman Hearing. I don't want to do it and I think it's unfortunate, but that's the situation we're in.

MS. RACE: And, Your Honor, this is Deborah Race and

I did just want to make sure. The counsel in this case was not really aware of this objection until late because Fulbright and Jaworski is walled off from the Dell case, and so the Fenners brought this to their attention and that's when we filed it.

THE COURT: All right. Well --

MR. CORNELIUS: Your Honor, this is Bill Cornelius.

If I could have just a moment, I -- I certainly heard what the Court has said that it feels like it needs to do, but the Defendants feel pretty strongly really that there's no valid reason to disqualify Mr. Egen. Would the Court be willing to entertain a little discussion of that now?

THE COURT: Yes, go ahead.

MR. CORNELIUS: Deb, we just don't see a conflict. In fact, your order does not mention a conflict. Fenner's objection does not assert a conflict, and we just don't think there is one. Dell obviously is not a party to this case, and as the Court points out in the order, the work that Mr. Egen is doing has nothing to do with the patents-in-suit. So we're just not seeing a conflict that would require his disqualification.

MS. RACE: Your Honor, on behalf of the Fenners, again, Fulbright was not aware of this, but in this particular situation, Mr. Egen's law firm actually does represent Dell. His partner's brother is actually in charge of the Fenner case with Dell. There's so many connections between Dell and Mr.

```
Egen's firm that the Fenners just are not comfortable and
1
2
     believe that that presents a very, very real conflict, in their
 3
     opinion, because of all of the connections between Mr. Egen's
     firm and the Dell litigation.
 4
               MR. CORNELIUS: Your Honor, Bill Cornelius again.
 5
 6
     That same logic would -- would say very clearly that it's just
7
     as inappropriate for Fulbright to be involved in this case as
8
     counsel, because they do work for Dell just like Mr. Egen does.
9
               MS. RACE: And that's a matter -- that's a matter,
10
     Bill, that has already been raised, and as you know, Fulbright
11
     is not representing and is actually walled off in that Dell
12
     litigation.
               MR. CORNELIUS: Well, it's I think a little
13
14
     disingenuous for Fulbright to make that argument.
15
               THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Race, what is -- setting aside
16
     this argument about Mr. Egen's partner's brother, what is the
17
     first argument you have, the first point you made?
18
               MS. RACE: That Mr. Egen's firm is actually
     representing Dell and doing quite a bit of work in the actual
19
20
     -- I mean for Dell in other litigation.
21
               MR. CORNELIUS: Judge, that's a pretty attenuated
22
     relationship to -- to bring down a Markman on a
23
     disqualification basis.
               THE COURT: Okay. So, Ms. Race, Mr. Egen's firm does
24
25
     work for Dell?
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 8 of 13

MS. RACE: Mr. Egen's firm does work for Dell. Egen's partner's brother is the in-house counsel for Dell actually handling the Fenner litigation, and another brother of Mr. Egen's law partner is a partner in Fulbright as well. mean, there are just all kinds of connections between Mr. Egen and the Dell litigation and the Fenners. The Fenners -- and Mrs. Fenner is actually an attorney, and the Fenners just believe that that is -- is too much connection between Egen's law firm and their Dell litigation. THE COURT: And so, Ms. Race, you -- you didn't know any of this at the time you agreed to Mr. Egen? MS. RACE: No, and that's -- from what I understand from Mr. Govett, who couldn't be on the call, with Fulbright, they were not aware of the Dell connection between Mr. Egen at that time. They're -- they're not -- as this Court knows, they're walled off from the Fenner-Dell litigation and they were not aware of the situation until the Fenners advised them. MR. CORNELIUS: Judge, how could they not know that Mr. Egen's partner's brother worked for Fulbright? MS. RACE: Oh, well, that -- now, that part, I imagine they -- I don't know about that. I talked to Brett really exclusively about the Dell litigation. THE COURT: Well, Ms. Race, how did the Fenners not know of the Dell connection?

MS. RACE: The Fenners -- and, again, I don't know

the answer to that. The Fenners may indeed have known at some point but they did not advise counsel of this until recently, and that was when we filed the motion.

THE COURT: Well, okay. Look, I'm going to sustain the objection, but, you know, we're just put in somewhat of a bind here, but I feel like sustaining the objection is the right thing to do and we just need to move on.

So your Markman Hearing is rescheduled to April 23rd.

As far as the timing of it, we'll just have to deal with it as we get there, but, you know, that's going to be your date, so --

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$  CORNELIUS: Bill Cornelius. Could I -- could I ask one more question?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. CORNELIUS: Would it make any sense -- as the Court may recall, we had previously moved to consolidate these two cases, without success. This, it occurs to me, might call for reconsideration of that. Are you willing to entertain some argument on that?

THE COURT: Well, not at this point, Mr. Cornelius.

I think that my original intention that this case should

proceed on the track it's on has -- it remains, so, no, I'm -
I think -- you're free to file a motion to that effect, taking

into account these new circumstances, but I feel like at this

point it's best to just get this Markman Hearing done and this

case moved on. I wish we could do it this week, but I feel like in the circumstances that have been presented, this is going to be the best thing to do is move it off. So you're free to file a motion but I'm not going to entertain any argument on it at this time.

MR. CORNELIUS: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. Anything else?

MR. VASQUEZ: Yes. Judge, this is Rich Vasquez again for SMC and Enterasys. Speaking to the date issue, Your Honor, your last statement appeared to me to be that the hearing is continued to April 23rd, when earlier I believe you had indicated you had sympathy for the prejudice that the order of the 23rd would put upon my law firm, which is already scheduled to be before Judge Davis at the exact same time.

Given the -- what I believe is an ineffective explanation by the Plaintiff as to why they're bringing this to the Court at this late date, I would hope that the Court would give us some latitude and not schedule it on April 23rd and allow us not to be prejudiced by this late scheduling. We scheduled all of our trial properly and with diligence. Clearly they did not.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, let me do this. I had hoped that April 23rd would work. That's a date I can fit it in. I am open to other dates. In fact, I'm open to earlier dates than this, than April 23rd.

Let me just tell you that I'm sustaining the objection.

I'm appointing Mike McLemore. You guys -- everybody try to agree on a date, and I strongly encourage you to agree on a date, and the earlier the better.

So let me give you a chance to give me a date. I'll give you until Friday to give me a date. Otherwise, I'm going to pick a date. It may be April 23rd. It may be earlier than that. It somewhat depends on Mr. McLemore's availability, but we can work with him and get a date that works for him as well.

So y'all see if you can agree on a date by Friday, a date that would -- everyone could do it, which is difficult, I understand, but we're going to have to work around some things, number one. Number two, a date that's earlier rather than later. That would give you an opportunity to keep your trial schedule as it is. That would be my -- my preference.

All right. Any questions with regard to that?

MR. MORRISSETT: Your Honor, Steve Morrissett for Extreme Netgear and D-Links. If you're talking about a date in March, as long as we're bringing it up, we have -- would have a problem during that month, because as other counsel, we have scheduled court hearings and we have discovery matters that really can't be moved, so we would be prejudiced if we get into that. So we are all facing those problems. We will work with

all of the other counsel.

MR. YARBROUGH: Judge, this is Trey Yarbrough. In light of -- I know the Court is going to need to check with Mr. McLemore on his availability. Do you want the parties -- is the Court going to coordinate matters with Mr. McLemore or should the parties be talking with him as well, and would you like a couple of alternative dates, several dates versus one? What is your preference?

THE COURT: Well, certainly if y'all can agree on several dates, that would be preferable. But as far as Mr. McLemore, no, the Court will be in contact with him, so we'll just communicate dates to him that y'all have available and then we'll give you a date that it can be done. So y'all work on it and hopefully give me something. If not, I'm going to set it, and again, it may be earlier than April 23rd, but that will just be the date that you'll have to deal with, so --

MR. YARBROUGH: How quickly would you like to hear back from us, Your Honor?

THE COURT: I would like to hear by Friday. I mean, if y'all can get it to me today, that would be obviously preferable, but I'll give you until Friday.

All right. Any other questions?

MS. RACE: Not from the Plaintiff.

MR. CORNELIUS: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much for being

```
13
 1
     on the line.
 2
               MS. RACE: Thank you, Your Honor.
 3
               THE COURT: Have a good day.
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
     I hereby certify that this transcript has been prepared to
21
     the best of my ability from an electronic sound recording.
22
23
24
     Jan Mason
                                        Date
25
```